UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

IN RE: . Case No. 10-93904-BHL-11

.

EASTERN LIVESTOCK CO., LLC,

110 U.S. Courthouse 121 West Spring Street

New Albany, IN 47150

Debtor. .

April 23, 2012

. 9:55 a. m.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
BEFORE HONORABLE BASIL H. LORCH, III
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Fifth Third Bank: Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP

By: RANDALL D. LaTour, ESQ.

52 East Gay Street, P.O Box 1008

Colombus, OH 43216-1008

For Blue Grass DelCotto Law Group, PLLC

Stockyards, et al.,: By: LAURA DAY DEL COTTO, ESQ.

200 North Upper Street Lexington, KY 40507-1017

Audio Operator: Amy Bruckert

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609)586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

For First Bank: Faruki, Ireland & Cox, P.L.L.

By: DANIEL J. DONNELLON, ESQ.
201 East Fifth Street, Suite 1420

2

Cincinnati, OH 45202

For Arcadia Stockyard, W. Scott Newbern, PL

et al.:

By: WALTER SCOTT NEWBERN, III, ESQ.

2982 East Gevemy

Tallahassee, FL 32309

For James A. Knauer: Kroger Gardis & Regas, LLP

By: JAMES A. KNAUER, ESQ.

111 Monument Circle, Suite 900 Indianapolis, IN 46204-5125

Faegre, Baker, Daniels, LLP By: KEVIN M. TONER, ESQ.

HARMONY A. MAPPES, ESQ. 300 N. Meridian St., Suite 2700

Indianapolis, IN 46204-1750

For Superior

Livestock, et al.:

Greenebaum, Doll & McDonald By: C.R. BOWLES, JR., ESQ.

JOHN W. AMES, ESQ.

IVANA B. SHALLCROSS, ESQ.

1010 South 5th Street Louisville, KY 40202

For Joplin and Superior: Rubin & Levin, P.C.

By: JOHN M. ROGERS, ESQ.

CHRISTOPHER M. TRAPP, ESQ.

500 Marott Center

342 Massachusetts Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46204-2161

For Trustee Michael

Walro:

Rubin & Levin, P.C.

By: JAMES T. YOUNG, ESQ.

342 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 500

Indianapolis, IN 46204

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For James A. Knauer: Hoover Hull, LLP

By: SEAN T. WHITE, ESQ. 111 Monument Cir Ste 4400 Indianapolis, IN 46244 TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

Law Offices of Peter M. Gannott For Laurel:

By: PETER M. GANNOTT

12910 Shelbyville Road, Suite 115

3

Louisville, KY 40243

For Joplin and Superior: Rubin & Levin, P.C.

By: ELLIOT D. LEVIN, ESQ.

500 Marott Center

342 Massachusetts Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46204-2161

For Fifth Third Bank: Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP

> By: ERIC RICHARDSON, ESQ. 221 East Fourth Street Suite 2000, Atrium Two Cincinnati, OH 45202

For Trustee Kathryn Pry: Dale & Eke, P.C.

By: MEREDITH R. THOMAS, ESQ.

9100 Keystone Crossing, Suite 400

Indianapolis, IN 46240

For the U.S. Trustee: Office of the U.S. Trustee

By: CHARLES R. WHARTON, ESQ. 101 W. Ohio St. Ste. 1000 Indianapolis, IN 46204

For First Bank and

Ayres, Carr & Sullivan, P.C. Trust Company: By: JOHN R. CARR, III, ESQ. BRET S. CLEMENT, ESQ.

251 East Ohio Street, Suite 500 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2186

Faruki, Ireland & Cox, P.L.L. By: STEPHEN A. WEIGAND, ESO. 201 East Fifth Street, Suite 1420

Cincinnati, OH 45202

For J&F Oklahoma Holdings, Inc.:

Naman, Howell, Smith & Lee, PLLC

By: DAVID L. LeBAS, ESQ.

8310 N. Capital of Texas Highway

Suite 490

Austin, TX 78731

For CPC Livestock, LLC: Snell & Wilmer, LLP

By: JESSICA E. YATES, ESQ.

1200 Seventeenth Street, Suite 1900

Denver, CO 80202

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

For Trustee James Faegre, Baker, Daniels, LLP

Knauer: By: TERRY E. HALL, ESQ.

300 N. Meridian St. Ste. 2700

Indianapolis, IN 46204

For Friona Industries Spro

LLP.:

Sprouse, Shrader, Smith, P.C. By: JOHN FREDERICK MASSOUH, ESQ. 4

701 South Taylor, Suite 500

Amarillo, TX 79101

For Willie Downs: Lloyd & McDaniel, PLC

By: ANDREW D. STOSBERG, ESQ. 11405 Park Road, Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223-0200

For Anna Gayle Gibson: Deitz & Freeburger, P.S.C.

By: SANDRA D. FREEBURGER, ESQ. 101 First St., 2nd Fl(42420) Henderson, KY 42419-0021

- - -

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

15

16

17

21

23

matter.

THE COURT: ... on the phone? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're getting them. THE COURT: We're getting them? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're getting them -THE COURT: Anybody appearing by phone? (No audible response) THE COURT: We're starting a little early, so we'll take them as they connect. All right, as I said, we're going to have to finish by 11:30 or else if we don't we're going to take a break and reconvene at 1:30, so let that be your incentive to speak quickly. (Audio off) UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: If would make the most sense to just start with the beginning and the East West Trucking THE COURT: All right. UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Your Honor, the Trustee has

5

18 resolved all but one of the objections and that is the one to 19 the claim of Fifth Third Bank. Let's see, we have Fifth 20 Third's counsel here, as well. We have been discussing the possibility of settling the objection of the claim. Trustee's preference, I guess, would be to get this matter set for a final hearing maybe six weeks out, thereabouts, to give 24 parties a chance, we either get something resolved or just get 25∥it -- just get the Court's resolution of it. It's costing the

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

24 II

25

6 1 estate about \$500 a month to keep the bank account open, and I $2 \parallel$ know in the other cases that's probably not much, but in the Trucking case, we're the small one of the group and we have everything else in the case resolved, but for this issue. 4 THE COURT: Mr. LaTour? MR. LaTOUR: Your Honor, I would suggest that it be set for a final hearing on June 11, which is the omnibus hearing date of June --THE COURT: That's fine. MR. LaTOUR: -- and we'd like that all to be resolved 11 before that. THE COURT: All right, that's fine with me. We'll set it for June 11th at the end of the omnibus date, if 14 necessary. UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: So, all other objections to claims have 17 been resolved? UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: We have, Your Honor. 19 a pending motion right now with the resolution of Trustee Knauer's claim and the others have been -- but, basically, there were no other responses other than Grant Gibson. found a stipulation with Grant Gibson, so those were the three. THE COURT: All right, you're going to go ahead and

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

submit me an order then approving and denying claims with

everything included, except the Fifth Third matter?

1	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right, very good.
3	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you.
4	THE COURT: All right, in the Thomas and Patsy Gibson
5	case, anybody here for the Trustee?
6	(No audible response)
7	THE COURT: They're probably not on the line yet.
8	All right, we'll come back to that. Let's go on to the main
9	case.
LO	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: If we jump to Page 6, Item
L1	13, Your Honor, there's a number of related similarly situated
L2	cases that relate to newly filed collection claims on accounts
L3	receivable of Eastern. Those had been set for a status
L4	conference today, but the fact of the matter is counsel for the
L5	defendants are not really yet appearing and just starting to
L6	get going, so if we could continue that?
L7	THE COURT: Are you starting with the Corey Kay and
L8	
L9	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Correct.
20	THE COURT: So, matters 13 through 18?
21	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Yes.
22	THE COURT: All right, so you want all those extended
23	to June?
24	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Yes. Is that the next
2 5	omnibus date?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They wanted an extension 1 2 (Indiscernible). 3 UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: May the 14th. UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: There's one May, but these 4 5 folks haven't filed appearances yet. I anticipate they won't 6 really be ready for initial disclosures and scheduling orders until June. 7 8 THE COURT: They've asked til June 15? 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, our next omnibus date is 10 June 11th. 11 THE COURT: All right. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They asked for an extension 12 13 beyond that. THE COURT: They've asked -- some of them have asked 14 15 for extensions to answer til June 15th, so that would even be 16 after the June -- but they'll be in the case by then. We can 17 at least have a brief pretrial. UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: It makes sense. 18 19 THE COURT: So, I'll show matters -- those matters are all continued to June 11th. This goes a lot faster when we 21 don't have half the people on here, you know. 22 (Laughter) 23 UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: You may be on to something. 24 THE COURT: I think I'll just start having these with 25∥individual attorneys. We'll get a lot done, you know.

All right. What about the main -- going back to the 2 main case? The matter is continued from prior hearing?

MR. TONER: Yes, Your Honor. There are motions for a 4 protective order related to depositions, and you'll see this has been filed in the main case, as well as several of the adversary proceedings.

THE COURT: You're right.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

MR. TONER: They're also similarly situated. I think it's Fifth Third's motion.

THE COURT: Yes, we've dealt with this a few times. So, what's the current status, Mr. LaTour?

MR. LaTOUR: Your Honor, the motion was originally filed to deal with the potential overlap between the special counsel's investigation under Rule 2004 and the other depositions. The 2004 exams are not yet finished. Consequently, the other protocol is not finished.

You'll see the next item down on the agenda was the 18∥ motion -- well, somewhere down in here was a motion filed by First Bank with respect to that, tying it to a request for an extension of time. I think there are really three separate pockets of issues. There was the 2004 exam, there were the interpleader actions, generally, and there was the Packers & Stockyards issue, in particular.

An attempt has been made to create a linkage between 25∥ the completion of the 2004 depositions and the Packers &

1 Stockyards issue. I believe, that linkage is erroneous, 2 because any particular packers and stockyards transaction has 3 to be looked at transaction by transaction, and Fifth Third was 4 not involved in each of those transactions and, therefore, as 5 to Packers & Stockyards issues, is not going to have relevant 6 information.

Now, the situation's different if you're talking about the interpleader at large, because there are other claims made that are broader than the Packers & Stockyards Act, and that's where a deposition protocol would be helpful and is so being developed.

7

8

11

12

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

So, I think the resolution for the motion for the protective order is that we continue doing what we're -- what the original plan was, which is to develop a deposition protocol.

With respect to the various motions for extensions of 17 time on the Packers & Stockyards Act issue, Fifth Third is not opposed to a 60-day extension from the date presently set in May, so that would take them 60 days out to a date certain in July. I don't see a reason to tie it to a floating date or to move it 90 days out and all that.

THE COURT: Okay, I saw -- yes, I saw your pleadings to that effect. Let me hear somebody respond to that because I've -- that -- I think I, at least initially, agree with the heart of what you're saying, and that is, I thought those

1 matters are going to be separate from the matters that are 2 being explored in the 2004, and so I don't know that it -- when 3 I know one of the reasons for waiting is that you don't want to 4 duplicate discovery, but it does seem to me like the discovery is going to have to be a lot more specific and tied to certain transactions. But -- go ahead?

MR. LaTOUR: Well, if you grant 60 days from the presently pending deadline, which is in May --

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

THE COURT: That give you about 90 more days.

MR. LaTOUR: -- that's 90 days, so if somebody wants 11 to propound discovery, they can, and there's time to get that 12 accomplished.

THE COURT: Does anybody object to -- I know some people I think had sought extensions and had been waiting to conduct that discovery. Does anybody think that that's not an adequate period of time to do that?

MS. DEL COTTO: Your Honor, I guess I'm just confused

THE COURT: Join the crowd.

MS. DEL COTTO: -- I have sort of been relying on others more involved in the discovery to understand some game plan that coordinates everything. Apparently, that is very difficult to achieve and it has not been achieved yet.

The estate has paid a lot of money for an 25∥investigation that's not yet concluded, and my clients, for

one, would like to know the full result of that investigation 2 and all of the facts that the Trustee knows to complete that investigation before they have to go forth and figure out what 4 additional targeted discovery they need to do. And that is why $5\parallel$ we, for one, ask that we be given additional time after we receive the evidence that the Trustee is relying on, and that our time run from that day. I know Mr. White filed something apparently very late last night, which I have not read, that says at least now he will be completely finished and have his 10 report done by the end of May.

So, 60 days from that day may be enough, but, I mean, I have to know that the report's going to be done. So, now, when I hear there's a lot more. There's a privilege log that hasn't been given yet. There's additional depositions. There's this. There's that. I mean, I'm just sort of lost in the lack of protocol, I guess I'll call it.

> THE COURT: Okay.

1

7

11

12

15

16

17

18

19 II

20

21

22

23

24

MR. LaTOUR: Your Honor, if I could respond to that and can clear up some of the confusion? The deposition protocol is going to get worked out as soon as the first round of depositions was finished with the 2004 examination.

The supposition that that report is going to shed light on the individual transactions that are the subject of the Friona interpleader and the other interpleader actions, which are transaction specific, which Ms. DelCotto's client has 1 the records for the specific transactions in which they were 2 involved. So, the information that's going to shed light on Packers & Stockyards issues are already in the control of her 4 client, and my client doesn't have any information that is 5 transaction specific in those transactions.

6

7

11

13

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

Now, is there any possible word that might overlap between two? Yes, there is, because you could say the words "Packers & Stockyards Act." But, as far as useful information to help understand the transaction, my client doesn't have that information, so saying that we all have to wait until my client produces information that does not exist and is not within its 12 control, is just wasting time.

Now, I thought 60 days -- we put this out far enough that people could give it a try and if it works out that they still need more time, then ask for more time then.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Toner?

MR. TONER: Thank you, Your Honor. There was no 18∥disagreement in any of the papers filed that these creditors have done anything in the 90 days the Court granted since your ruling in February. It's unfortunate that they've chosen to wait for the special counsel's questioning of bank witnesses, because the amount of overlap between PASA issues and that testimony is close to none.

The special counsel filled out a report last night 25∥ that said he was optimistic that he could complete the final

report by the end of May, but there is one witness who hasn't

been located. He's involved in -- an ex-employee involved in

the fraud part of the bank, but there's no reason to believe he

would know anything about cattle transactions.

If creditors were allowed their relief to move deadlines it will have quite an effect, putting us into the fall. Ms. DelCotto has asked to bump a trial date in August in the Downs adversary proceeding. It just seems to me that the incentives would be right if they were told to complete this discovery, get the briefs on file, by July as opposed to the end of the summer. I think it's a reasonable amount of time to get going on the specific cattle transaction evidence.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. DEL COTTO: Your Honor, could I just give one example that I'm aware of so you can have a little bit of understanding? Mr. Knauer has given an affidavit that he has reviewed all the books and records of Eastern Livestock and he is aware of no genuine issues of material fact that Eastern ever acted as a market agency.

Now, one of the things that came out during the discovery by the special counsel are documents of Fifth Third where the ad consultant said the books and records of Eastern are in such disarray we cannot tell how they acted, and Fifth Third, you cannot really tell how they acted. And, secondly, we don't have all the records that Eastern filed with GIPSA for

3

4

71

9

10

11

12

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

15

their licensing and their bond, but what we do have and what we 2 can find says that they've got \$14 million worth of market agency transactions.

Now, none of those questions were asked in the first 5 round of depositions, but Mr. Knauer has given an affidavit that he's not aware of any genuine issues of material fact and he wants to go forward with a summary judgment motion, and he now has those facts in his possession, which I believe, on their very face, create a genuine issue of material fact.

So, I mean, to say that my clients are dilatory and are not doing anything, when I thought we came to court a few months ago and said we're going to have this coordinated effort and we're going to let the Trustee finish, because Fifth Third's witness would be whipsawed and have to do this deposition and that deposition, and then come in here today and say these people are being dilatory, again, I must not understand what I thought we accomplished in February, which was to say we're going to have a coordinated effort, we're going to let the Trustee finish his job first, and then everyone else can do their follow-up as necessary, and that, unfortunately, now, is going to take more time because the Trustee hasn't finished his (indiscernible) yet.

MR. TONER: I don't want to leave a misunderstanding about that affidavit on the record, Your Honor. I believe, it states that there is no reason to conclude that Eastern is a

6

11

12

17

19

21

22

23

1 market agency selling on commission on behalf of any cattle 2 producers. And as Mr. LaTour said earlier, that is information 3 really uniquely in the possession of these cattle producers and 4 livestock auctions.

MR. DONNELLON: Your Honor, I want to -- apparently, part of the problem, because I volunteered to create this protocol, which I regret at this point, because I did circulate it a couple of months ago, but I had thought on Ms. DelCotto's statements that this linkage or overlap was something that was 10 recognized back in February, because I was the one who stood up and said, wait a minute, if we're having this 2004 go forward and we still have this 90-day deadline on the Packers & Stockyards issue, we may not be able to have Mr. White ask all the appropriate questions. And Your Honor said, as I quoted in my brief, I'm not going to make him answer your questions and I'm not going to make these go longer than we need to, we'll take this in two rounds, he'll do round one, then you'll do 18 round two.

But, now, we're told, when you should have been doing round two during the middle of round one, and there's no overlap at all of no possibility because you should -- these witnesses aren't going to have any information.

And I'll give you just one short example, as I know we're pressed on time. At the deposition of the field examiner Patty Voss, she was asked, question, "What did you understand

1 Eastern Livestock's business to be?" Answer, "They were a 2 cattle broker." Question, "What did you understand that to 3 mean?" Answer, "Purchasing and selling cattle on behalf of 4 others, on behalf of themselves at times." Question, "Do you 5 know whether Eastern Livestock received a commission on the 6 sale of cattle?" Witness, "I believe I saw commission accounts in their general ledger."

We don't have the general ledger of Eastern Livestock. I've asked the Trustee's counsel on a couple of $10 \parallel$ occasions whether DSI, who preserved the forensic records of 11 | Eastern in computers, has tried to reconstruct the general 12 ledger, and that's never been done.

7

8

9

13

15

17 **I**

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But, here, we do have a Fifth Third witness who said they sold cattle and received a commission, which would indicate a market agent selling on commission, which is different from what Mr. Toner just said, and that the witness says it's in the general ledger that Eastern Livestock has that I saw when I was at Eastern Livestock, I, a Fifth Third Bank representative. But, none of the cattle producers and cattle sellers even have that information. And, then, we're being told, well, you should have been doing it earlier and you shouldn't overlap these two rounds of discovery.

And, frankly, Your Honor, I'm just simply frustrated that I volunteered to create a protocol that would help assist the Court and protect Fifth Third from getting seven different

7

8

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 notices of deposition, and I've gotten no response on it, $2 \parallel \text{except from Mr. White, and I want to be relieved of that}$ 3 responsibility that I have to generate a protocol. This was 4 being done to assist Fifth Third in response to their motion to limit the depositions, and now we're still not even finished 6 with this round one.

Your Honor had even said when we had the telephonic conference to Mr. White, you can do these three continuation depositions, you can do two more of the five you'd like, and if you still think you need to take more discovery of Fifth Third, come present it to me at the next omnibus.

Certainly, one could reasonably conclude from that that the three other depositions and two additional witnesses would have been completed before the omnibus so Mr. White could advise the Court of whether he needed more. But, we don't even have these scheduled until the middle of May at this point, so simply saying, okay, 60 days from the current extension should be enough for everyone is too narrow of a focus.

We had two rounds of discovery that was supposed to happen. After the second round, we were supposed to have, as Your Honor said, on a simple motion, extend the Packers & Stockyards deadline. We've got testimony from the Fifth Third witnesses about the market agents selling on commission and the general ledger records. None of that is in possession of the cattle producers. None of the cattle --

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

4

7

9

11

15

16

17 **I**

18

19

20

21

22

24

MR. DONNELLON: -- producers were in the position of Fifth Third to see that. And I will sit down.

Okay. I've heard enough on this. THE COURT: 5 think that -- I mean, there's a valid point. Both sides have some valid points. The -- but, I think -- I mean, I think one thing that's true is that the great majority of what's being asked about now goes to I think what's being explored by the Trustee is the banks role in all of this, and whether they have $10 \parallel --$ the Trustee had claim against the bank.

So, obviously, there's some overlap with the -- and 12 there's some information that could be relevant to the claim of the cattle producers, but that's not the thrust of what's being explored in this round of discovery. So, here's what I'm going to do. Mr. White is here now?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: He was going to participate by phone. I don't know if he's on the line.

THE COURT: Is he on? Mr. White?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: Is anybody on the phone?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: That's not good. I suspect people are 23 trying to get on, don't you?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Your Honor, I talked with Mr. 25 White yesterday evening and it was my understanding he was

1 going to participate by phone, so he may be having some 2 problems. I don't know.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

17 **I**

18

20

21

23

THE COURT: And Terry Hall was going to participate?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: And my co-counsel was going to participate by phone. I know that.

THE COURT: So, go see if -- go see if the line's open. We opened the line, but maybe there's some glitch. Well, here's what I want. I want a -- Mr. White, in his report, says that he thought he could have report by, what, May 12 the --

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: 31st.

THE COURT: Naturally. So, what we'll do is, we'll 15 extend the deadline to August 15th, and the parties can wait for that report or not wait for that report. I am going to ask, when we get Mr. White on here, that what he does have be filed by that date. I don't want this thing held up because we 19 can't find a witness. If, you know, that --

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Your Honor, Mr. Herr's (phonetic) deposition, the one they can't find, I don't think that will hold up the report. Mr. White and I talked to him on the phone and interviewed him many months ago. We simply wanted to solidify what he told us and get it on the record, 25∥ but we know what he -- basically, what he has to say.

THE COURT: All right. So, there's probably no 2 reason we won't have that report by the end of May?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: I don't think that would hold 4 it up.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me check out the phone status 6 here before we go forward. Do you show the line open?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It won't show (indiscernible) in the system, but as soon as she transfers, it will (indiscernible) and so I'm just waiting now for her to transfer them over.

11 (Pause)

1

3

5

7

8

10

12

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Maybe this phone's not working. 13 right, we're going to take about a five minute break and see if 14 \parallel we can get the people on the phone and included.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Thank you, you can be seated. All right, 17 we're back on the record. I have a list now of the people that 18∥are appearing by phone, so you don't have to state your appearance. If you do speak, please say your name at that time. I'd also ask that you not put us on hold and that you keep your phones on mute.

We're discussing -- we've done something very briefly in the East West Trucking case, which I don't think any of you 24 are interested in. We're now in the main case. The parties 25∥ have made some arguments concerning, or at least related to,

1 Fifth Third's original motion to limit discovery.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

The Court has decided to extend the date. $3 \parallel$ matter is that actually in the -- is that in the Superior 4 adversary?

MR. TONER: It's in the Friona of Texas interpleaders.

> THE COURT: Friona, the interpleader adversary.

MR. TONER: As well as in the main case in several contested matters.

THE COURT: Yes, to August -- the current deadline was, what, 90 days after the Court's order in February?

> MR. TONER: Or which was May 10.

THE COURT: Which is May 10, so that I've now extended that to August 15. We've had some discussion about the overlap and lack of overlap in that discovery. Mr. White, are you on?

> MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And part of this timetable is based upon 19 the report that you filed I believe last evening indicating that you're going to have your report on file by May 31st, correct?

MR. WHITE: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, and what I would like to say to you is that if you're missing some small part of what you would like to include in a final report, file a report anyway

1 and just indicate that you intend to supplement it with x, y, $2 \parallel$ or z, when available, because we want to get this -- we want to keep this moving, if possible, okay?

MR. WHITE: Yes, sir. I understand.

THE COURT: All right.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. TONER: Just, Your Honor, so that we're comprehensive on those motions for enlargement of the time, we would offer to tender orders on each of the contested matters where the PASA issue has been raised.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. TONER: And in the Downs adversary matter, which 12∥is next on our agenda, Ms. DelCotto and I will work out a new trial schedule and associated deadlines and tender that order, 14 as well.

THE COURT: All right. All right, now, let's talk then -- let's go back to the agenda in the main case. Does that resolve -- all right, you've got small Roman numerals I through -- one to four, under (A) --

MR. TONER: Those are all related to the same motion.

THE COURT: -- those are all related to the same issue. So, the motion extending those deadlines to August 15th should resolve those matters, at least temporarily?

MR. TONER: Yes, and the discussion of the deposition 24 protocol is still being worked out.

THE COURT: And -- yes. And you can't get out of the

4

7

8

9

13

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

THE COURT:

Yes.

1 protocol. Once you volunteer you're in, you know. Mr. Ames $2 \parallel$ could have told you that, never volunteer. Motion for extension of time, I'm on Page 2, Matter 5(A) --MR. DONNELLON: Just for clarification, Your Honor, 5 how would the protocol work if we're allowed to proceed with discovery now. Mr. LaTour has said he'll respond once Mr. White's finished. If we don't start discussing this protocol until late May --THE COURT: Talk to Mr. LaTour, and if you guys can't 10 | -- he has said here this morning that some of the stuff you 11∥ want to know about is not going to be included in these 2004 12 exams. It's going to be more discreet. It's going to be transition -- transaction specific, so it seems to me like you 14 all could have a discussion whereas you can proceed on those type of questions and information that you'd like. If you run 15 into any trouble, I'll get on the phone with you and resolve it. MR. DONNELLON: Great. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. MR. TONER: I believe that takes us to --THE COURT: Yes, that takes care of Matter 5(A) and then the -- and 5(B), right? 22 MR. TONER: Correct.

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

25∥right, let's talk about then these current contested proceeding

That's the deadlines issue.

status.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17 **I**

18

19

20

22

23

24

MR. TONER: When we were last together, Your Honor asked us to include where things stand in each case and what we 4 think is briefed, and then --

THE COURT: Yes, and I appreciate that.

MR. TONER: I don't believe -- I think each of these is affected by the rulings you made here this morning, and there's nothing --

THE COURT: So, none of these are fully briefed and ready to go?

MR. TONER: That's right.

> THE COURT: All right. So --

MR. TONER: If there's an exception, we'll (indiscernible) the Court, but I think this Packers & Stockyards issue's been raised in probably all of them.

THE COURT: All right, then the Downs adversary, as you just indicated, the -- you're going to set out a new scheduling order which will bump that August bench trial, based upon the Court's ruling this morning?

MR. TONER: That's right.

21 THE COURT: All right.

MR. TONER: There is remaining on Downs, under C(2) on Page 4, a motion for Laurel Livestock to file an amended pleading. The Trustee has no objection to that. There's no 25 reason it shouldn't be granted.

2

7

8

11

12

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Is anybody on for Laurel Livestock? MR. GANNOTT: Yes, Judge, Peter Gannott here for Laurel Livestock. What we did, we just wanted to make sure 4 that our affirmative defenses were the same as all the other 5 defendant's affirmative defenses, and that we would be bound by 6 the Court's summary judgment, as previously entered. THE COURT: All right. MR. GANNOTT: So (indiscernible) amended to have the affirmative defenses and we tendered an order that basically said nobody (indiscernible) to our pleadings. We're bound by the summary judgment to the extent (indiscernible). THE COURT: All right, I'll show that that motion is 13 granted and --MR. GANNOTT: Thank you. THE COURT: -- you can file your amended plea. That brings us to the Superior adversary. Obviously, we know where that stands based upon this morning's discussion, all right. 17 l 18 We're waiting for --UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: No, Your Honor --THE COURT: Well, I guess, we'll still have --UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: All motions. THE COURT: No. No, we don't have that.

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

on there. The other trailing summary judgment motions you're

probably thinking of are in the Texas interpleader matter.

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: All motions have been ruled

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

25∥ limit -- or that's the protective order motion --

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: That's the (indiscernible). THE COURT: The same thing. Yes, the -- in the Blue

Grass, does this relate to the matters that were -- the confidentiality agreement, et cetera?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

15

17 **I**

18

20

21

23

24

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: (Indiscernible).

THE COURT: What's the status of that now? I think we laid that over from the last hearing?

MS. DEL COTTO: Why don't you ask the bank to come 10 forward and say why they believe the documents were confidential late Friday and they filed something that 12 (indiscernible) that says that they believe the documents contain any confidential information about the bank's policies, loan terms, and things, so I guess we just agree to disagree on the matter of confidential. I don't know that it's really pressing because it has to do with Packers & Stockyards responses. But, at some point, it will have to be decided.

THE COURT: All right, if -- when do you want -- how 19 do you want it resolved? Do you want me to review something in camera? Do you want to have a hearing? Do you want to have a phone conference? Do you all want to meet? Or do you want to wait until you're further down the road in terms of discovery? Yes?

MR. NEWBERN: Your Honor, the -- Florida is involved 25 in this also, and Mr. LaTour and I reviewed the documents

earlier last week. And again, we're in the same situation, we $2 \parallel$ agree to disagree. It's a procedural matter as to how the documents that Fifth Third has produced and claims to be 4 confidential are to be handled in the court, what is to be and 5 what is not to be confidential? As well as, I suggest that it 6 may not be terribly pressing at this moment, but it will need to be addressed at some point.

THE COURT: All right. well, I don't want this -- I don't want this to hold up matters, so I --

MR. LaTOUR: Your Honor, if I could address that 11 please?

THE COURT: All right.

1

7

8

9

10

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. LaTOUR: The documents have been produced. The documents have been used in depositions. I anticipate the documents will be used in further depositions. I anticipate 16 the documents will be attached to pleadings. All of which, I 17 | have no problem with. I simply want them filed under seal. It's proprietary information of the internal workings of the bank. You give unfair business competitors an unfair advantage.

THE COURT: You all have them?

MR. LaTOUR: They have them. They've had them for months.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, do you care if you file them 25 under seal?

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DEL COTTO: I care when I care about the 2 transparency of a Chapter 11 process and what we're going do when we get the disclosure statement say that people are 4 supposed to vote on things and he has to release things, I think. THE COURT: I mean, do you care in a less philosophical manner? Do you care --(Laughter) MS. DEL COTTO: Yes, I do, because it adds burden on my client to mail you things and it's just -- and they're not confidential. THE COURT: All right. That's the point. I understand why MS. DEL COTTO: Fifth Third doesn't want them in the record. I wouldn't want them in the record either, but to say that they're documents about interest rates and --THE COURT: All right, are these the documents that I 18 have in --MS. DEL COTTO: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: -- the envelope that --MS. DEL COTTO: I have -- we could have a call with you where you have them? THE COURT: All right. I'm going to have to review

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

I'll review and then we'll have a call, because I've

just been happy to keep that envelope closed up until now.

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

because the parties are just now appearing and starting to ask

25∥ for continuances to file answers and the matters are not yet

3

5

7

9

10

12

13

15

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

the time.

1 ripe for pretrial protocols to be established. Let's go back to Thomas and Patsy Gibson matter. Who's on for the Trustee? MS. THOMAS: Your Honor, it's Meredith Thomas for the Trustee. We filed a motion for an enlargement of time to (indiscernible). It is our sixth motion. We're requesting an additional 90 days, based on the fact that we are still receiving information from the debtor that could potentially include information about a contract that we're not aware of at

THE COURT: All right, I'll show that that's granted 11 without objection.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor. And then our second issue is an application for allowing (indiscernible) Auctions, LLC, an order approving their employment with (indiscernible). We've been working with them to get appraisals of certain real estate and also some personal 17 property of the debtor, and he recently has sent us an invoice for his fees of \$1800, and we are requesting that his fees be paid out of the sale proceeds for the (indiscernible) and through the (indiscernible).

THE COURT: That motion will be granted without objection.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, is there anything further?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Nothing from the Trustee,

Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

7

9

11

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: From anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Omnibus dates?

Oh, yes. Let's talk about omnibus dates. THE COURT: $5\parallel$ We have May and June, correct? So, we need to go beyond then. We don't necessarily have to have these every month. As much as I enjoy your all company, and, you know, it is possible on occasion to -- as these cases developed, sometimes it's been my experience that we can accomplish just as much telephonically on just one matter and get parties just that are involved in that one matter involved, and so we don't always have to do it this way throughout the rest of this case. What about -- I mean, we've extended a lot of this to August. Is there any reason to have a July omnibus date?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: Why don't we just go to August omnibus date and then if anybody has something they want heard in July, just file a motion and we'll do it either telephonically or if it requires a live hearing, we'll do a live hearing, but only with those parties that are actually involved in the motion. So, having said that, I've got -- how about August 13th, on Monday, because that will be after the August 11th -- or the --UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: You said August 15th.

THE COURT: Excuse me, we said August 15th. -- we could do the 20th? Anybody have any preference? Let's

CERTIFICATION

I, WENDY ANTOSIEWICZ, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability.

/s/ Wendy Antosiewicz

WENDY ANTOSIEWICZ

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: May 10, 2012